Appendix H
WELFARE REFORM SAVINGS ESTIMATES

Title II. The Equitable Apportionment System and Flat Grants	Estimates *				Implemented by Caseload effect				
	All funds	State funds	County funds	Federal funds	Admin.	Regulation	Legislation	Eligibility	Grant
Flat Grant System of Welfare Payments		\$7,100,000	\$1,900,000	\$9,000,000		×			×
Special Needs Responsibility		0- 0	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	,	×			\times
Special Needs Reform	15,000,000- 28,100,000	5,000,000- 10,500,000	2,500,000- 3,500,000	7,500,000- 14,100,000		×			×
III. Developing Stricter Welfare Eligibility Standards									
Standardized Eligibility Operations	30,000,000	10,000,000	5,000,000	15,000,000			×	\times	
Eligibility—Basic Needs		7,100,000- 15,000,000	1,200,000- 7,500,000	8,100,000- 22,500,000		×		\times	
Eligibility and Grant Determinations		1,800,000- 3,000,000	600,000- 1,500,000	2,400,000- 4,500,000		×			×
"In-Kind" Income		27,000,000- 41,900,000	12,000,000- 13,200,000	36,000,000- 52,500,000		×			×
Definition of "Unemployment" in AFDC—Unemployed		10,400,000- 11,300,000	5,100,000- 5,500,000	3,500,000- 4,700,000		×		\times	
College Students on Welfare Rolls	1	8,100,000	3,800,000	11,200,000		×		×	×
Residence Requirements	1	3,800,000- 4,000,000	800,000- 1,000,000	4,000,000- 4,500,000		×		×	
Residency and Aliens on Welfare		23,600,000	5,800,000	(27,900,000)			$ \hspace{.05cm} $	×	
Definition of "Totally Disabled"		11,700,000- 16,000,000	(33,000,000) - (12,800,000)	13,100,000- 17,000,000			×	X	
IV. Closing Loopholes in the Welfare System									
"Work-Related" Expenses	25,300,000~ 65,000,000	8,700,000- 22,700,000	4,400,000- 10,900,000	12,200,000- 31,400,000		×		$ \times $	×
Averaging Income to Close Loopholes	3,000,000- 15,000,000	1,000,000 5,000,000	500,000- 2,500,000	1,500,000- 7,500,000		×		$\mid \stackrel{\frown}{\times} \mid$	
Leave of Absence From Job		40,000- 500,000	0- 200,000	60,000- 700,000		×		$\mid \stackrel{\wedge}{\times} \mid$	
Lump Sum Payments As Income		2,500,000- 4,300,000	500,000- 1,000,000	3,000,000- 5,000,000			×		×
Withholding Exemption Loophole		500,000	250,000	750,000		×	_ ^		X
"Two-Unit Family" Loophole	600,000- 6,000,000	200,000- 2,000,000	100,000- 1,000,000	300,000- 3,000,000		×			×
Income-Producing Property	4,500,000- 11,200,000	2,000,000- 2,000,000	500,000- 1,100,000	2,000,000- 5,500,000			$ \hspace{.05cm} $	$ \times $	^
Allowable Automobile Value	1,000,000	300,000	200,000	500,000		×	^		×
Maximum Value on Exempt Property	, ,	10,000,00	5,000,000	15,000,000		×		×	
VI. Reinforcing Family Responsibility									
Absent Fathers	40,000,000	5,000,000	15,000,000	20,000,000			×		~
Unwed Pregnant Minors	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2,900,000- 3,000,000	1,000,000- 1,400,000	4,000,000- 4,100,000		×	^	\times	×
Stepfather Responsibility	3,500,000- 6,600,000	1,500,000- 2,300,000	500,000- 1,100,000	1,500,000- 3,200,000			- X	×	×
Child Protective Services	300,000- 2,000,000	0- 0	100,000- 1,100,000	200,000- 1,500,000			\ \ \ \	^	^
Support From Out of State Relatives		1,300,000	200,000	, , ,		×			×
OAS Responsible Relative Support		17,600,000	2,900,000	1,000,000		×			×
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	11,500,000-22,100,000	1 ' '	20,500,000			X		^
\$20,000 Real Property Exemption	20,000,000~ 31,100,000	11,500,000- 22,100,000	2,000,000- 3,800,000	13,000,000- 25,200,000			×	×	
VII. Implementing the Welfare Reform Plan									
Simplified Welfare Regulations	The state of the s	500,000	0	0	×				
Overpayments of Welfare Assistance	1	3,600,000	1,100,000	4,400,000		×			\times
Expand and Intensify Audits		11,000,000- 22,000,000	6,000,000- 11,000,000	9,000,000- 18,000,000	×			×	\times
Confidentiality Laws	15,000,000	5,000,000	2,500,000	7,500,000			×	×	\times
Social Services	120,000,000-172,900,000	0- 0	30,000,000- 55,600,000	90,000,000–117,300,000		×			
Total	566,200,000-836,400,000	200,740,000-282,800,000	73,450,000–148,150,000	283,310,000–414,150,000					

^{*}The estimates of savings contained in this table are based on caseload estimates revised to February 28, 1971, including special data obtained from selected representative counties. In some cases, data were sufficiently dependable to pro-

ject a single estimate. In most instances, however, differing estimates required the establishment of ranges within which savings could reasonably be expected to fall. Conservative assumptions were utilized throughout the estimating

process, resulting in estimates of the minimum savings (whether single or range) that may reasonably be expected, without consideration of possible overlapping of affected populations.